

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
MIAMI DIVISION

CASE NO.:

WINDY LUCIUS

Plaintiff,

v.

MIA AESTHETICS CLINIC, LLC.

Defendant.

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Plaintiff, Windy Lucius (“Plaintiff”) sues Defendant, Mia Aesthetics Clinic, LLC, (“Defendant”), a Florida Limited Liability Company for Injunctive Relief, attorney’s fees, litigation expenses and costs under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181-12189 (“ADA”), 28 C.F.R. Part 36, *et seq.*

1. Venue lies in the Southern District of Florida pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and Local Rule 3.1, in that the original transaction or occurrence giving rise to this cause of action occurred in this District.

2. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 28 U.S.C. § 1343, this Court has been given original jurisdiction over actions which arise from Defendant’s violations of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* See also 28 U.S.C. § 2201 and § 2202.

3. Plaintiff is a Florida resident, is *sui juris*, and qualifies as an individual with disabilities as defined by the ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act of 2008, (“AADG”) 42 U.S.C. §12101, and the 28 C.F.R. §36.105(b)(2).

4. Plaintiff is legally blind, and substantially limited in performing one or more major

**Lucius v. Mia Aesthetics
Complaint for Injunctive Relief**

life activities, including, but not limited to, seeing, accurately visualizing her world, and adequately traversing obstacles. As such, is a member of a protected class under the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12102(1)-(2), the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 CFR §§36.101, et seq., and 42 U.S.C. §3602(h).

5. Plaintiff uses the internet to help her navigate a world of goods, products and services like the sighted. The internet and websites provide her with a window into the world that she would not otherwise have. She sues Defendant for offering and maintaining a website that is not fully accessible and independently usable by visually impaired consumers. Plaintiff uses the JAWS Screen Reader software, which is one of the most popular reader Screen Reader Software ("SRS") used worldwide to read computer materials and comprehend the website information which is specifically designed for persons who are blind or have low vision. Due to her disability, Plaintiff cannot read computer materials and/or access the internet and websites for information without help from appropriate and available auxiliary aids, and screen reader software specially designed for the visually impaired.

6. The Screen reader software translates the visual internet into an auditory equivalent. At a rapid pace, the software reads the content of a webpage to the user. "The screen reading software uses auditory cues to allow a visually impaired user to effectively use websites. For example, when using the visual internet, a seeing user learns that a link may be 'clicked,' which will bring her to another webpage, through visual cues, such as a change in the color of the text (often text is turned from black to blue). When the sighted user's cursor hovers over the link, it changes from an arrow symbol to a hand. The screen reading software uses auditory -- rather than visual -- cues to relay this same information. When a sight impaired individual reaches a link that may be 'clicked on,' the software reads the link to the user, and after reading the text of the link

**Lucius v. Mia Aesthetics
Complaint for Injunctive Relief**

says the word ‘clickable.’ Through a series of auditory cues read aloud by the screen reader, the visually impaired user can navigate a website by listening and responding with her keyboard.” *Andrews v. Blick Art Materials, LLC*, 17-CV-767, 2017 WL 6542466, at *6-7 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 21, 2017).

7. Plaintiff is also an advocate of the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purpose of asserting her civil rights. As such, she monitors websites to ensure and determine whether places of public accommodation and/or their websites are in compliance with the ADA.

8. Defendant, Mia Aesthetics Clinic, LLC, is a Florida Limited Liability Company, which owns and operates aesthetic plastic surgery clinics branded, “Mia Aesthetics,” and open to the public. As such, a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201(a) and 36.104, and located within this District. Defendant’s merchandise and services are also offered and available to the public through its website. Defendant’s clinics are a place of public accommodation pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)(F).

9. As the owner, operator, and/or controller of a plastic surgery clinic, Defendant is defined as a place of “public accommodation” within meaning of the ADA because Defendant is a private entity which owns and/or operates “a professional office of a health care provider, hospital, or other service establishment,” per 42 U.S.C. §12181(7)(F) and 28 C.F.R. §36.104(2).

10. Because Defendant is a plastic surgery clinic open to the public, each of Defendant’s physical establishments are a place of public accommodation subject to the requirements of Title III of the ADA and its implementing regulation as defined by 42 U.S.C.

**Lucius v. Mia Aesthetics
Complaint for Injunctive Relief**

§12181(7)(F), §12182, and 28 C.F.R. §36.104(2). Defendant also offers those items to the public through its website.

11. Defendant also controls, maintains, and/or operates an adjunct website, <https://miaaesthetics.com> (hereinafter the “Website”). One of the functions of the Website is to provide public information about Defendant's establishments, including special sales, goods, services, accommodations, privileges, benefits and facilities available to patrons at physical locations. Defendant also sells to the public its merchandise through the Website, which acts as a point of sale for merchandise available in, from, and through Defendant’s physical locations.

12. Defendant’s website is offered as a way for the public to become familiar with the “Mia Aesthetics,” locations, hours of operation, procedures, and other information Defendant seeks to communicate to the public. Through the website the public can learn about “Mia Aesthetics” procedures, prices, specials packages, book an appointment, as well as the ability to contact them online. The website also provides a link for the public to shop at their online store, and links to “Mia Aesthetics” Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, Twitter, SnapChat, and YouTube pages to learn about pop-ups and specials. By this nexus, the website is characterized as a Place of Public Accommodation subject to Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)(B) and 28 C.F.R. § 36.104(2).

13. The website is an extension of Defendant’s place of public accommodation. By and through this website, Defendant extends its public accommodation into individual persons’ homes, portable devices and personal computers wherever located. The website is a service, facility, privilege, advantage, benefit and accommodation of Defendant's place of accommodation. For example, the website provides a list of their products, locations, and the ability to shop at their online store and contact them. Defendant’s website provides access to benefits of Defendant’s

**Lucius v. Mia Aesthetics
Complaint for Injunctive Relief**

physical locations and Plaintiff was denied those benefits when she could not access Defendant's website. Therefore, the website has integrated with and is a nexus to Defendant's brick and mortar location. Therefore, it is governed by the following provisions:

a. 42 U.S.C. Section 12182(a) provides: "No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation."

b. 42 U.S.C. Section 12182(b)(1)(A)(i) provides: "It shall be discriminatory to subject an individual or class of individuals on the basis of a disability or disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements, to a denial of the opportunity of the individual or class to participate in or benefit from the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of an entity[.]"

c. 42 U.S.C. Section 12182(b)(1)(A)(ii) provides: "It shall be discriminatory to afford an individual or class of individuals, on the basis of a disability or disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements with the opportunity to participate in or benefit from a good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation that is not equal to that afforded to other individuals[.]"

d. 42 U.S.C. Section 12182(b)(1)(A)(ii) provides: "It shall be discriminatory to provide an individual or class of individuals, on the basis of a disability or disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements with a good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation that is different or separate from that provided to other individuals, unless such action is necessary to provide the individual or class of individuals with a good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation, or other

**Lucius v. Mia Aesthetics
Complaint for Injunctive Relief**

opportunity that is as effective as that provided to others[.]”

e. 42 U.S.C. Section 12182(b)(1)(B) provides: “Goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations shall be afforded to an individual with a disability in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of the individual.”

f. 42 U.S.C. Section 12182(b)(1)(C) provides: “Notwithstanding the existence of separate or different programs or activities provided in accordance with this section, an individual with a disability shall not be denied the opportunity to participate in such programs or activities that are not separate or different.”

g. 42 U.S.C. Section 12182(b)(2)(ii) describes as discrimination: “a failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations[.]”

h. 42 U.S.C. Section 12182(b)(2)(iii) describes as discrimination: “a failure to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the entity can demonstrate that taking such steps would fundamentally alter the nature of the good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation being offered or would result in an undue burden[.]’

14. As the owner or operator of the subject website, Defendant is required to comply with the ADA and the provisions cited above. This includes an obligation to create and maintain a website that is accessible to and usable by visually impaired persons so that they can enjoy full

**Lucius v. Mia Aesthetics
Complaint for Injunctive Relief**

and equal access to the website and the content therein, including the ability to shop through the website, and contact the desired location.

15. Since the Website is open to the public through the internet, by this nexus the Website is an intangible service, privilege, and advantage of Defendant's brick-and-mortar stores that must comply with all requirements of the ADA, must not discriminate against individuals with visual disabilities, and must not deny those individuals the same full and equal access to and enjoyment of the goods, services, privileges, and advantages as are afforded the non-visually disabled public both online and in the physical locations. As such, Defendant has subjected itself and the Website to the requirements of the ADA.

16. Plaintiff attempted to access and/or utilize Defendant's website to test for accessibility, to browse through the services and online information to educate herself as to "Mia Aesthetics" locations, procedures, prices, specials packages being offered, at the brick and-mortar locations, but was unable to, and she continues to be unable to enjoy full and equal access to the website and/or understand the content therein because numerous portions of the website do not interface with the VoiceOver screen reader software. Features of the website that are inaccessible to VoiceOver screen reader software users include, but are not limited to, the following (citing the WCAG 2.1 Level A and AA Guidelines):

- i. Guideline 2.4.3 – Focus Order is violated. The 'Save \$100...' dialog was displayed while users were navigating the homepage, but it was not announced, and focus didn't automatically move to it. Users continue to press the tab key until they reach the end of the page, but focus never moved into this dialog, so SRUs will not be aware of it.
- ii. Guideline 3.3.2 – Labels or Instructions. The Cart quantity is displayed on the Cart button, but it is not announced in a way that a user would know the meaning of it. In this case, users had two items in the cart, but the two were added to the total price, so users heard "\$1,400.002 Cart link." A user will believe this is the price only since there aren't any labels or information to inform them that the last digit of the price is actually the cart quantity.

Lucius v. Mia Aesthetics
Complaint for Injunctive Relief

- iii. Guideline 1.4.5 – Images of Text. The text in the promotional offers, available on the homepage carousel, are not announced. Users included screen captures for two of the images in the carousel, but users had the same experience with all of the images. In each case, the content was not announced. In most cases, we heard only "blank" and then focus moved down to the 'Why Mia Esthetics?' text which is the next section below the carousel.
- iv. Guideline 1.4.5 – Images of Text. (2). The Size Charts, such as the one for the 'Mia Sculpt Customer Stage 3 Garment - Cocoa' is inaccessible. None of the content in the size chart was announced, or navigable using arrow or tab key navigation.
- v. Guideline 4.1.3 – Status Messages. The 'Out of Stock' status message isn't announced when it's displayed. After users selected a product size of '2XL' for the 'Satin Sleep Set - Turquoise' product, then the 'out of stock' message was displayed, but it was not announced. We then navigated to the 'Add to Cart' button, which was displayed in a dimmed state, however, it's not announced as 'dimmed' so users will not hear that it cannot be selected. Since the out-of-stock message isn't automatically announced and the Add to Cart button is not announced as "dimmed," a user will not be aware as to why no action occurs when they select the Add to Cart button.

17. The fact that a portion of the WCAG 2.1 Level A and AA Guideline violations may relate to various third-party vendor platforms does not absolve Defendant of culpability. Because restaurants are places of public accommodation, their operators are subject to the requirements of Title III as well. 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)(b). Those requirements include a prohibition against subjecting patrons with disabilities to discrimination “through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements,” such as use of third-party vendors’ inaccessible platforms for making reservations. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(A); *See Kohler v Bed Bath & Beyond of Cal., LLC*, 780 F.3d 1260, 1264-66 (9th Cir. 2015) (Pre-existing obligations under Title III of the ADA may not be avoided through contractual arrangements, and those obligations remain even where compliance is under control of another party); *Robles v. Yum! Brands, Inc.*, 2018 WL 566781, *4 (C.D. Cal. January 24, 2018) (restaurant operators are liable for website and mobile app accessibility where there is a nexus to the restaurants themselves).

18. Plaintiff continues to attempt to use the website and/or plans to continue to attempt

**Lucius v. Mia Aesthetics
Complaint for Injunctive Relief**

to use the website in the near future, and in the alternative, Plaintiff intends to monitor the website, as a tester, to determine whether it has been updated to interact properly with screen reader software.

19. That Plaintiff could not communicate with or within the Website left her feeling excluded, frustrated, and humiliated, and gave her a sense of isolation and segregation, as she is unable to participate in the same browsing, shopping experience, and access to the same information, sales, and services, as provided at the Website and in the physical locations as the non-visually disabled public.

20. As more specifically set forth above, Defendant has violated the above provisions of the ADA by failing to interface its website with software used by visually impaired individuals. Thus, Defendant has violated the following provisions either directly or through contractual, licensing or other arrangements. Defendant's violations have resulted in Defendant denying Plaintiff effective communication on the basis of her disability in accordance with 28 C.F.R. Section 36.303 *et seq.*

a. by depriving Plaintiff of the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of its place of public accommodation (42 U.S.C. § 12182(a));

b. in the denial of providing Plaintiff the opportunity to participate in or benefit from the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations (42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(A)(i));

c. in failing to allow Plaintiff to participate in or benefit from a good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation that is equal to that afforded to other individuals (42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(A)(ii));

**Lucius v. Mia Aesthetics
Complaint for Injunctive Relief**

d. by providing Plaintiff a good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation that is different or separate from that provided to other individuals (unless such action is necessary to provide the individual or class of individuals with a good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation, or other opportunity that is as effective as that provided to others) (42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(A)(iii));

e. by failing to afford Plaintiff goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of the disabled individual (42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(B));

f. notwithstanding the existence of separate or different programs or activities provided in accordance with this section, by denying Plaintiff the opportunity to participate in such programs or activities that are not separate or different. (42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(C));

g. by a failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities (unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations) (42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(ii)); and,

h. by a failure to take such steps as necessary to ensure that disabled individuals are not excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services (unless the entity can demonstrate that taking such steps would fundamentally alter the nature of the good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation being offered or would result in an undue burden) (42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(iii)).

21. As a tester using screen reader software, Plaintiff is unable to effectively access,

Lucius v. Mia Aesthetics
Complaint for Injunctive Relief

navigate, and communicate with Defendant through the Website due to her blindness and the Website's access barriers. Thus, Plaintiff as well as others who are blind and with visual disabilities will suffer continuous and ongoing harm from Defendant's intentional acts, omissions, policies, and practices as set forth herein unless properly enjoined by this Court.

22. As the result of the barriers to communication which are present within the website and by continuing to operate and/or benefit from the website with such barriers, Defendant has contributed to Plaintiff's frustration, humiliation, sense of isolation and segregation and has deprived Plaintiff the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges and/or accommodations available to the public. By encountering the discriminatory conditions at Defendant's website and knowing that it would be a futile gesture to attempt to use the website unless she is willing to endure additional discrimination, Plaintiff is deprived of the meaningful choice of freely visiting and utilizing the same accommodations readily available to the public and is deterred and discouraged from doing so. By maintaining a website with violations, Defendant deprives Plaintiff the equality of opportunity offered to the public.

23. Plaintiff has suffered (and will continue to suffer) direct and indirect injury as a result of Defendant's violations until Defendant is compelled to comply with the ADA and conform the website to WCAG 2.1 Level A and AA Guidelines.

24. Plaintiff has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from Defendant's non-compliance with the ADA with respect to this website as described above. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that she will continue to be subjected to discrimination in violation of the ADA by Defendant. Plaintiff desires to access the website to avail herself of the benefits, advantages, goods and services therein, and/or to assure herself that this website has complied with the ADA so that she and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment

**Lucius v. Mia Aesthetics
Complaint for Injunctive Relief**

of the website without fear of discrimination.

25. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law and is suffering irreparable harm. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorney's fees, costs and litigation expenses from the Defendant under 42 U.S.C. § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.

26. Plaintiff and all others similarly situated will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein.

27. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff Injunctive Relief, including an order to require Defendant to alter its website to make it readily accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with vision impairment.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, Windy Lucius demands judgment against Defendant, Mia Aesthetics Clinic, LLC, and requests the following injunctive and declaratory relief:

- a. The Court issue a Declaratory Judgment that determines that the Defendant's website at the commencement of the subject lawsuit is in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq.;
- b. The Court issue a Declaratory Judgment that determines that Defendant's website is in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq.;
- c. The Court issue a Declaratory Judgment that Defendant has violated the ADA by failing to monitor and maintain its website to ensure that it is readily accessible to and usable by persons with vision impairment;
- d. That this Court issue an Order directing Defendant to alter its website to make it accessible to, and useable by, individuals with disabilities to the full extent required by Title III of the ADA;
- e. That this Court enter an Order directing Defendant to evaluate and neutralize its

**Lucius v. Mia Aesthetics
Complaint for Injunctive Relief**

- policies and procedures towards persons with disabilities for such reasonable time so as to allow Defendant to undertake and complete corrective procedures;
- f. That this Court enter an Order directing Defendant to continually update and maintain its website to ensure that it remains fully accessible to and usable by visually impaired individuals;
- g. An award of attorney's fees, costs and litigation expenses under 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and,
- h. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Respectfully submitted this August 9, 2024.

By: /s/ Juan Courtney Cunningham
Juan Courtney Cunningham, Esq.
FBN: 628166
J. Courtney Cunningham, PLLC
8950 SW 74th Court, Suite 220,
Miami, Florida 33156
T: 305-351-2014
cc@cunninghampllc.com
legal@cunninghampllc.com

Counsel for Plaintiff